PALESTINE

BETWEEN

ROGERS' PLAN

AND

THE SECURITY COUNCIL'S RESOLUTION

"Withdrawal will not bring peace... but... we want a state that will remain overwhelmingly Jewish in character, composition, society, culture and spirit."

ABBA EBAN
from a statement to the Jerusalem Post 28 January 1968, P. 8, Col. 1

"It lies upon the people's shoulders to prepare for the war, but it lies upon the Israeli army to carry out the fight with the ultimate object of erecting the Israeli Empire".

MOSHE DAYAN
From a statement broadcast on the Arabic program, Radio Israel, 12 February 1952.

"All the old maps of Israel which had the pre-June 5 Armistice lines, were only of historical value."

YIGAL ALLON
Le Monde, 23 February 1968

PALESTINE
BETWEEN
ROGERS' PLAN
AND
THE SECURITY COUNCIL'S RESOLUTION

Published by
"al-Thawra" Newspaper
Baghdad 1970

Printed by
Dar Al-Jamhuriyah Press

"The development of the crisis in the Middle East is both dangerous and instructive. For over twenty years Israel has expanded by forces of arms. After every stage in this expansion Israel has appealed to "reason" and has suggested "negotiations". This is the traditional role of the imperial power, because it wishes to consolidate with the least difficulty what it has taken already by violence. Every new conquest becomes the new basis of the proposed negotiation from strength which ignores the injustice of the previous aggression. The aggression committed by Israel must be condemned, not only because no State has the right to annex foreign territory, but because every expansion is also an experiment to discover how much more aggression the world will tolerate.

The refugees who surround Palestine in their hundreds of thousands were described recently by the Washington journalist I.F. Stone as "the moral millstone around the neck of world Jewry". Many of the refugees are now well into the third decade of their precarious existence in

temporary settlements. The tragedy of the people of Palestine is that their country was "given" by a foreign Power to another people for the creation of a new State".

Bertrand Russell
January 31, 1970

From a message to the International Conference of Parliamentarians held in Cairo, February, 1970.

On May 1, 1970, the World Labour Day, President Nasser made an important political speech which he wound up with a message addressed to the American President Richard Nixon couched in the form of a grave and serious warning. In his appeal to Nixon President Nasser had said: "American policy, in its absolute alignment with Israel, has reached extremes which no responsible Arab can possibly pass in silence. America should therefore have second thoughts about its attitude before things get out of everybody's control and relations between the Arabs and America become irretrievably shattered. As a minimum, we call upon America to take either one of two courses to prevent the further deterioration of the situation.

1. If America is genuinely desirous of peace, it should order Israel to withdraw from the Arab territories occupied in the June war. We believe that it is in the power of America to do so, because it is she who accounts for the survival of Israel.

2. In case America came up with the claim that Israel is not all that obedient to her, we are

quite prepared to credit this regardless of our own private opinions on the matter. In this case, however we have one single demand to make and which is certainly in the power of America to meet, namely, that she forthwith desist from rendering any political, economic or military aid to Israel as long as Israel remains in occupation of our territories."

The tenor of that grave declaration on the part of President Nasser made it quite clear that in the event of America's non-response, its political, strategic and economic presence in the whole region would run the risk of utter ruin along with all institutions and forces revolving in the orbit of American diplomacy.

A short while later, President Nixon disclosed an intention of the part of the U.S. to come forward with a new initiative for establishing peace in the Middle East. Subsequently, that initiative was made known in the form of a peace formula drafted by the U.S. Secretary of State Rogers and communicated at the time to the Soviet Union and to the two governments of the U.A.R. and Jordan. Up to varying points, the plan was also made known to some other Arab countries and to some major powers at the Security Council. Though the plan was right from the

outset shrouded in complete secrecy, certain informed quarters in the U.A.R., Algeria, Libya, Sudan and Syria, agreed that the socalled American peace initiative was nothing but a final reiteration by the United States of its absolute and irreversible sponsorship of Israel's aggressive designs and its determination to go on being hostile to the Arab Nation and to indefeasible rights of the Arabs to the end. As such, the American initiative could only be met with categorical rejection because there is none in the Arab Nation, governor or governed who could bring himself around to accepting the American proposals or passing them in silence.

In the intervening period, developments followed one another in quick succession in the Arab arena: the massacre of the commandos in Jordan, Goldman's visit to Morocco and his conference with Hassan II, Gaddafi's tour of Arab countries, the Tripoli meetings and President Nasser's visit to the Soviet Union.

On July 23, 1970, President Nasser surprised the Arab Nation by announcing the U.A.R.'s approval of the American proposals put forward in what has come to be called the Rogers' plan. In a speech he made at the Fourth National Convention of the Arab Socialist Union held on July

24, President Nasser defended his acceptance of the Rogers' plan as follows:

"In our opinion, the plan is no different from the Security Council's resolution of November 22, 1967. This being the case, we found ourselves face to face with two alternatives. We could either say that we did not propose to give a reply to the United States, thereby playing into the hands of Israel in its endeavours to secure more arms deliveries from the United States or signify our acceptance of what we already accepted back in 1967, which we did."

In the light of this attitude and following in its footsteps, the Jordanian government announced its approval of the Rogers' plan. Subsequently, Kuwait, Sudan, Libya and Lebanon, all served notice, in one way or another that they did not object to the plan and that they were quite prepared to approve of it. Finally, Israel announced its acceptance of the plan.

The attitude consistently taken by Iraq towards the Security Council's resolution has consisted of utter rejection to that resolution, its ramifications and whatever liquidationist formulas that might branch out of it. Such attitude all too well known to the Arab and international public opinion, should necessarily be applicable to the

recent Rogers' plan which, in the words of its authors and those who applauded it, was nothing more than a revised — or may be distorted — form of the original resolution that met with unequivocal reaction.

It goes without saying that revolutionary Iraq's rejection of the Security Council's resolution portrayed the unanimous rejection of the resolution by the masses of the Arab Nation which reckoned with the resolution as an imperialist-Zionist conspiracy whose express purpose was to perpetuate the Arab defeat on June 5 along with the tragedies which that defeat entailed. Another purpose of the conspiracy was to liquidate the Palestine issue and consolidate the Zionist invasion at the expense of the people of Palestine.

If therefore, the Rogers' plan is merely a facsimile picture of the Security Council's resolution — as its propagators claim it to be — then the Arab Nation has already passed its judgement on it when it said "NO!" to the original plan.

But another development has taken place. FATAH has published what was described as "the secret papers of the Rogers' plan". Abdul Muneim al-Rifaie, the Jordanian Prime Minister, conceded the authenticity of the documents when question-

ed about them. The U.A.R. assumed silence and the American government declined either to confirm or deny. This all places us along with Arab public opinion face to face with objective comparison between the Security Council's resolution and the Rogers' plan. The comparison conclusively shows that the latter is far worse than the former and in fact goes up to the limit of asking the Arab Nation to submit obsequiously and ignominiously to the sum total of Israel's avidities and dictates and consistently advanced since the first Israeli invasion by such Zionist leaders as Eshkol, Ben Gurion, Golda Meir, Dayan and others.

What is noteworthy, however, is that the Rogers' plan, far from being a mere new version of the Security Council's resolution, is in reality a precise and thorough codification of the proposals put forward by Nahum Goldman in the course of his secret audience with Hassan II — proposals which Goldman himself subsequently published in the French newspaper Le Monde and close on whose heels there came the birth of the Rogers' plan.

We are not beside the point when we assume that inasmuch as the Security Council's resolution was an imperialist-Zionist conspiracy wearing an

international mask, the Rogers' plan was a pure Zionist conspiracy with an American mask.

Lest therefore Arab public opinion should once again fall prey to acts of deceit and optical illusions, we are hereby dotting the i's and crossing the t's by drawing up an objective comparison between the Security Council's resolution and the Rogers' plan to show how they compare one to another in their iniquitous evils and dangers.

It will thus clearly be seen that the conspiracy in the Security Council's resolution consisted of perpetuating the despoilation of the sacred rights of the Arabs of Palestine as things stood before June 5, 1967. By contrast, the Rogers' plan does not stop at that limit of glaring treason and betrayal of the Arab Nation but goes beyond that to giving a permanent character to the Zionist despoilation of Arab lands and Arab rights before as well as after the June 5 aggression.

Below we are bringing into the limelight a comparison between the evils and dangers of the Security Council's resolution and Rogers' plan:

FIRST. The Security Council's resolution took a uniform view of the June 5 aggression and its traces and reckoned with it as a dispute between

two sides: the Arabs and Israel. Consequently, the resolution approached the question of the occupied Arab territories as a whole and required the Israeli forces to withdraw from all territories occupied in the June war.

In contrast, the Rogers' plan split the issue of the aggression and its traces into three separate questions: the Egyptian-Israeli dispute, the Jordanian-Israeli dispute and the Syrian-Israeli dispute. The plan dealt with the first two and totally ignored the third. The plan called for settling each dispute separately in accordance with terms and commitments that vary from one case to another according as America and Israel deemed favourable to them. No one can be blind to the perils inherent in this splitting of the same issue. The most serious of these perils is the submission to Israel's desire to deal with the Arab states piecemeal thereby actually shattering the unity of Arab struggle against Israel and conceding that the Arab-Israeli conflict is nothing other than separate regional disputes unrelated one to the other and should be settled now or in the future by direct contacts between the Arab states concerned and Israel or through a mediator.

The first effect of this fragmentation of the Arab issue in the Rogers' plan was that the plan

did not touch the question of the occupied Syrian territories on the grounds that the Syrian regime had not agreed to the Security Council's resolution. In other words, this means that any quarter consenting to the Rogers' plan necessarily and unreservedly binds itself to refrain from discussing the question of the occupied Syrian territories and agrees to leaving out the Golan Heights from the Governorate of Konaitra and the slopes of Mount Hermon under Israeli occupation along with perpetuating the homelessness of some 200,000 Arab citizens now living in tents in the Damascus area. From this, it follows that acceptance of the Rogers' plan is as good as the relinquishment of the occupied Syrian territory or at least agreeing to their remaining indefinitely under Israeli occupation.

SECONDLY. The Security Council's resolution, in its demarcation of frontiers between Israel and the Arab countries based itself on the armistice lines of 1948-49 — at worse at the pre-June 5 frontiers. The Rogers' plan, by contrast, has this to say:

"The two sides, the U.A.R. and Israel, agree on secure and recognized frontiers marked on a map or maps certified by the two sides and forming a component of the final agreement. This

shoud include all other things which peace represents such as agreeing on demilitarised zones, the taking of security and tactical arrangements in Sharm el-Sheikh area to ensure the freedom of navigation in the Tiran Straits and the taking of practical measures to settle the question of Gaza in a final manner. The former international frontiers between Egypt and the former mandatory regime in Palestine shall constitute the secure and recognized frontiers between Israel and the U.A.R.".

The question now to be asked is this: "What does all this talk in the Rogers' plan amount to? What does approval of it means? The matter requires no philosophizing; it is as clear as daylight. It amounts to an open annexation of the entire Gaza Strip in the occupied territories in Palestine, in other words Israel. Is that all? No! The U.A.R. further commits itself to take all necessary measures to help Israel achieve a final settlement of the question of the Gaza Strip. But what sort of settlement is needed once the Gaza Strip is wholly annexed to Israel? Without doubt. this means eviction of the Arabs of the Strip to swell the refugee camps in the neighbouring Arab countries as already happened, noiselessly and without the ado of formal agreements, in respect to the population of the occupied Syrian territories.

THIRDLY. The Security Council's resolution and all U.N. resolutions preceding or following it have firmly denounced any change in the status of Jerusalem and required Israel to maintain the status quo as before the war. But the Rogers' plan explicitly provides that:

"Jordan and Israel (the two of them alone, of course), shall work for an agreement on the status of the city of Jerusalem and the final arrangements for municipal boundaries of the unified City. The two sides shall agree that Jerusalem has a special status springing from the following principles:

a. Jerusalem should be a unified City in that no restrictions may be imposed on the movement of persons and goods in it.

b. No restrictions should be imposed on access to the unified City for any creed or race.

c. The administrative rules for the unified City should take care of the interests of all of the population and the interests of the Jewish, Islamic and Christian communities. The two governments of Israel and Jordan should be assured as to their respective roles in running the civil, economic and religious life in the city."

In former U.N. resolutions, the status of Jerusalem was considered within the framework of

an Arab character and the question of the City assumed world dimensions in respect to both Islam and Christendom. In more than one resolution, the U.N. condemned any change in the status of Jerusalem and called upon Israel to lift off its hands. The Rogers' plan, however, totally disregarded all of those world resolutions and looked upon Jerusalem as an exclusively Jordanian-Israeli problem. In the final analysis, it consecrated Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

FOURTHLY. The Security Council's resolution viewed the problem of Palestine refugees as one of the questions of the Arab-Israeli dispute and called for an equitable settlement of this problem. In contrast, the Rogers' plan installed the Jordanian government as sole custodian on Palestine refugees who were thrown into homelessness ever since the 1948 catastrophe. As such, the issue of the Arab refugees ceases to be an Arab one and becomes a matter of exclusive concern to the Jordanian government in agreement with Israel. Besides, any agreement to be reached between the Jordanian government and Israel should also receive the blessings of the U.A.R. who should further smooth its implementation, as should anybody else designated for this purpose by Dr. Jarring.

More serious than anything else is the fact that the plan did not make the implementation of the agreement conditional upon a settlement of the refugee question but stipulated that other clauses of the agreement should be put into effect at once and that the refugee problem could wait until all other questions and details had been settled.

FIFTHLY. The Security Council's resolution settled down to formally requiring the parties concerned to end the state of war and concede to each country in the region its sovereignty, territorial integrity and the right to live in peace within secure and recognized frontiers not open to acts of force or threats of force. The Rogers' plan is not satisfied with all of this. It goes beyond it to require the U.A.R. and Jordan to do everything in their power to ensure that no acts of aggression and no hatred-stirring acts (meaning of course, information media) shall be directed against Israel not only by government agencies and officials but also by ordinary citizens or popular organisations.

In our opinion, this stipulation in the Rogers' plan is without parallel in international usages and squarely conflicts with plain commonsense. Otherwise, how can a state be held

accountable for the acts of ordinary citizens or free popular organisations which, right from the outset, have been placed outside all legalistic considerations and which consistently have rejected such considerations all and sundry.

The stipulation carries one single significance. It is that the quarters accepting the Rogers' plan shall undertake to liquidate the resistance movement in their respective countries and make of their own security organisations instruments of protecting the frontiers of Israel.

SIXTHLY. Israel's swift approval of the Rogers' plan is in itself revealing. It points out to the fundamental differences between this plan and the Security Council's resolution which Israel has rejected and still rejects not because it is in its disfavour but because it is deemed not as adequate to give the final quietus to the Arab Nation as the new Israeli plan, the Rogers' plan.

These are some of the glaring differences between the Security Council's resolution and the Rogers' plan. Even unmindful of the secret supplementary agreements which are yet to come to the limelight, one can put it all in a nutshell: Whereas the Security Council's resolution invited the Arabs of Palestine to relinquish in favour of Israel their territories occupied prior

to the agression of June 5, 1967, the Rogers' plan asks them to abandon to Israel most of the terirtories captured in Palestine and other Arab countries whether before or after the June 5 aggression.

Another question crying for an answer is this: Is the Rogers' plan the last thing? As it appears, the answer is no. This plan has more in it than meets the eye. Assuming that the regime in the U.A.R. is — at least for the time being — capable of shouldering the responsiblity of consenting to this grave plan and working for its implementation, it is public knowledge that this cannot be so in Jordan and that the regime there is too infirm to stand up to the consequences of this ruinous adventure. Neither America nor Israel can be blind to this fact. Now what is the real purpose of putting forward the plan and of having it accepted?

One shall have to assume one of two possibilities. Either plans had been worked out in advance for an open foreign intervention with the object of occupying Jordan and crushing the forces of the Palestinian revolution or it was all an act of throwing dust in the eyes of people. In the latter possibility, the thrusting of Jordan in the Rogers' plan as regards Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip and

the West Bank was all made in agreement with the Jordanian regime which will inevitably fail to carry out the agreement thereby providing Israel with an excuse to retain the West Bank and even embark on new expansionist aggression.

Now what does it all boil down to? It boils down to an imperialistic Israeli conspiracy to isolate the U.A.R. from the issue of Arab destiny and from the Arab East entirely. The conspiracy also aims at demilitarising Sinai and establishing joint and permanent Egyptian-Israeli security measures in Sharm el-Sheikh and the Gulf of Aqaba to be followed with the achievement of final peace between the U.A.R. and Israel in return for the latter's withdrawal from Sinai alone, leaving the tragedy in the Arab East as it is.

There should be no room for optimism or passiveness when it comes to dealing with the issues of destiny of our Arab Nation. We ought never to blind ourselves to clear indicators and concrete facts. Rather, we must shed more light and be sincere in our endeavours to delve to the core of truth. We should do so lest the June 5 catastrophe should repeat itself in a more disastrous manner.

At any rate, the will to endure, to vanquish oppression and wrest freedom will remain, among the masses of our great Arab Nation, stronger than all evils and intrigues. Final victory will be for the masses.

APPENDIX

1. Resolution 242 (1967).
   Adopted by the Security Council at its 1382nd. meeting, on 22 November 1967.

2. Rogers' Plan.

RESOLUTION 242 (1967)
ADOPTED BY THE SECURITY COUNCIL AT ITS 1382ND MEETING, ON 22 NOVEMBER, 1967.

The Security Council,

Expressing its continuing concern with the grave situation in the Middle East,

Emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security,

Emphasizing further that all Member States in their acceptance of the Charter of the United Nations have undertaken a commitment to act in accordance with Article 2 of the Charter,

1. **Affirms** that the fulfillment of charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which should include the application of both the following principles:

(i) Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict:;

(ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for an ack-

nowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

2. **Affirms further** the necessity

(a) For guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area;

(b) For achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem;

(c) For guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area, through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones:

3. **Requests** the Secretary-General to designate a Special Representative to proceed to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution;

4. **Requests** the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the progress of the efforts of the Special Representative as soon as possible.

ROGERS' PLAN

Who Is Behind The So-Called Peaceful Solutions?"

Fatah newspaper of Amman, the organ of the Central Committee of the Palestine Resistance Movement, in its issue of July 26, 1970 published the full text of the Rogers' plan along with secret documents that have to do with the sought-after peaceful solution and the verbatim text of a programme of action intended as the foundation of Arab-Israeli negotiations patterned on the 1949 Rhodes negotiations.

In an introduction, Fatah said: "The Rogers' plan to which attempts are made these days to put it into effect was not born overnight. Rather, it was the outcome of protracted consultations involving many quarters, with the U.S. acting as mediator."

The plan and documents as published by Fatah were as follows:

PART ONE:

The recent developments in the Middle East including the events in Jordan have convinced us

that we must act swiftly to overcome the impasse coming in the way of a peaceful settlement. The situation is, we believe, serious and dangerous. Jordan and the U.S. are held together by cordial and close ties. We must cooperate for the sake of our common interests. We look forward to the quarters concerned and, in particular, to your government, which can play an important role in moving along with us for seizing upon this opportunity which, if lost, will cause painful and sad consequences. In this spirit, I urge your government to give full attention to the ideas which I am outlining below:

We are interested and concerned in arriving at a durable and just peace. We want to help the parties concerned attain to this objective. We have worked out new and practical proposals and consulted all parties concerned as to the need for compromise solutions and the attainment to a settlement by which peace can be established.

In our opinion, the most effective way of arriving at a settlement is to enable the parties concerned to get down to work under the supervision of Dr. Jarring with the object of taking the necessary priority steps to implement the Security Council's resolution No. 242 of 1967. Concerning the above-mentioned ideas, the American government lays before you the following proposal.

FIRST:

(a) Each of Jordan, the U.A.R. and Israel shall agree to observe ceasefire at least for a limited period.

(b) Each of Jordan and Israel, also the U.A.R. and Israel shall agree to a statement to be issued in the form of a report submitted by Ambassador Jarring to U.N. Secretary U Thant providing that Jordan, Israel and the U.A.R. have notified us that:

(a) They agreed to the Security Council's resolution No. 242 and were prepared to put that resolution completely into effect. They also agreed to appoint delegates for talks to be conducted under my supervision at the time and place I shall set, taking into account the form preferred by each of the parties concerned on the basis of their former experience.

(b) The object of the above mentioned talks is to arrive at an agreement for establishing a just and durable peace based first on mutual recognition between Jordan and Israel and between the U.A.R. and Israel of the sovereignty of each of them and the preservation of its territorial structure and political independence.

SECOND:

Israel's withdrawal from the territories occupied in 1967 in accordance with the Security Council's Resolution No. 242.

With the object of smoothing by assignment to arrive at an agreement as per resolution No. 242, the parties concerned shall strictly observe the ceasefire order issued by the Security Council at least from the beginning of July to the beginning of October.

Lastly, we hope that Jordan will find this proposal acceptable. We will endeavour to secure the consent of Israel. At the same time, you will agree with me that we must do everything to keep this proposal secret so as not to jeopardize the chances of its acceptance.

The verbatim text of the programme of action intended as the basis of Arab-Israeli negotiation patterned on the Rhodes negotiations.

FIRST: Egypt and Israel.

Israel and the United Arab Republic:

Taking into consideration their commitments under the U.N. Charter;

Affirming their obligations under the Security Council's Resolution No. 242 dated November 22, 1967;

Expressing their preparedness to put that resolution into effect in good faith;

Acknowledging the principle of securing no territorial aggrandizement by means of war;

Recognising the necessity of establishing just and durable peace in the Middle East under whose terms each state in the region can live in peace;

Agree that their representatives shall under the supervision of Ambassador Jarring, follow the procedures successfully pursued in Rhodes in 1949 with the object of arriving without delay — and on the basis of the points listed below — at a final and binding agreement on the modes of implementing the Security Council's resolution No. 242 dated November 22, 1967 for creating just and durable peace.

POINT ONE: The two sides, in arriving at a final agreement described by the final document or documents as a comprehensive settlement on the basis of fundamental principles, agree to a timetable and to the method by which the armed Israeli forces are to withdraw from the territories of the U.A.R. occupied during the 1967 with the above-mentioned point. An agreed plan is also to be worked out for discharging what remains of the provisions of the Security Council's resolution No. 242.

POINT TWO: The state of war and the actual war between Israel and the U.A.R. shall come to an end. A normal state of peace shall arise between them, with each of the two sides refraining from acts incompatible with the state of peace and the ending of the state of war. In particular the following points shall be observed:

1. Th armed forces or other forces of either side, be they, land, naval or airforces shall not carry out acts of aggression or threaten such acts against the forces of the other side.

2— Each side shall undertake, to the best of its power, to guarantee that no acts of aggression and no military acts shall take place in its territories whether by government agencies or officials or ordinary persons or organisations.

3— Each side shall refrain from interfering directly or indirectly in the domestic affairs of the other side for political, economic or any other reasons.

4— The two sides shall affirm that in their mutual relationship, they will guide themselves by the principles mentioned in Article 2, paras. 3 and 4 of the U.N. Charter.

POINT THREE: The two sides shall agree to the establishment of secure and recognised frontiers between them. Such frontiers are to

be demarcated on a map or maps endorsed by both sides and made part of the final agreement and giving expression to all other senses denoted by peace. This will include agreement by the two sides to set up demilitarised zones, practical security arrangements in Sharm al-Sheigh area to guarantee the freedom of navigation in the Straits of Tiran and the final settlement of the question of Gaza. The former international frontiers between Egypt and the Palestine mandatory authority shall be the secure and recognised frontiers between Israel and the U.A.R.

POINT FOUR: In order to create a sense of inviolability and to ensure the security and safety of the recognised frontiers, the two sides shall, pursuing the procedures stated in the last para. of the introduction to this document, seek an agreement on the following:

(a) The demilitarised zones and the steps to be taken for ensuring them.

(b) The practical security measures in the area of Sharm al-Sheikh guaranteeing the freedom of navigation in the Straits of Tiran.

(c) Practical security measures to settle the question of Gaza.

POINT FIVE: The two sides shall agree, the Security Council shall endorse, that:

(a) The Straits of Tiran are an international waterway.

(b) The principle of the freedom of navigation for all countries including Israel applies to the Straits of Tiran.

POINT SIX: The U.A.R. in exercising sovereignty rights over the Suez Canal, acknowledges that ships of all nations, including Israel, have the right to use the Canal without discrimination and without interference.

POINT SEVEN: The two parties agree to adopt the condition of the just settlement of the refugees issue according to the agreement reached by Jordan and Israel and to take part according to Ambassador Jarring's views or wishes to work for attaining the conditions of this settlement. It is understood that the agreement between the U.A.R. and Israel shall be parallel to that between Jordan and Israel and shall include the agreement up on a just settlement for the refugees issue following the attainment of the above-mentioned agreement.

POINT EIGHT: The U.A.R. and Israel mutually agree to respect each other's sovereignty, political independence and the right to live peacefully within safe, recognised frontiers.

POINT NINE: Following the final agreement between the two parties its texts shall be immediately circulated in the U.N. and the Security General requested to have the signatures of the parties upon it and then endorsed by the Security Council and all members of the U.N. Beginning from the date of its deposite the document shall be binding on all parties concerned and inviolable and the parties concerned will commence to carry out and observe the conditions of the agreement. Within the conditions of the final agreement all parties concerned undertake to have their commitments mutual and interconnected. The final agreement stipulates that if one of the parties concerned failed to carry out its commitments the other party is entitled to stop observing these decisions totally or partially.

POINT TEN: Both parties agree to submit the final agreement to the Security Council for voting. It is assumed that France, Britain, the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. shall support this decision and undertake to combine their future efforts for helping the parties concerned to abide by the texts of the final agreement or agreements.

JORDAN AND ISRAEL

In accordance with the obligations of the U.N. Charter and in order to reaffirm their commit-

ment to the Security Council's resolution No. 242 dated November 22, 1967, and in view of their readiness to carry it out completely by recognising the impermissibility of seizing other states territories by means of war and the necessity for establishing a permanent and just peace in the Middle East in which every state in this area has the right to live in peace and agree to have their representatives supervised by Ambassador Jarring, follow the methods which both parties employed in the Rhodes negotiations of 1949 to start without delay along the lines of the following articles to reach a final agreement binding on all parties upon the steps for implementing the Security Council's resolution No. 242 of November 1967 for establishing just and permanent peace in the area.

1— Both parties should reach a final agreement or agreements to solve all the questions at issue along the above mentioned principles and decide upon:

FIRST: The agenda.

SECOND: Attainment of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Jordanian territory occupied during the conflict in 1967 into border lines which have to be drawn and agreed upon according to point three and to a plan for implemen-

ting all the other suspended articles of the Security Council's resolution of 22nd November 1967.

2—Ending the state of war and enmity between Israel and Jordan and establishing an official state of peace between them; preventing both parties from carrying out any acts contrary to the state of peace and especially:

a— Refraining from carrying out any aggressive act or threatening to do so on the part of the armed forces and other forces whether land, naval or air of any party against the people and the armed forces of the other party.

b— Both parties will undertake to exert all their efforts against carrying out any aggressive or hostile acts whether on the part of the state organs, officials, ordinary persons or organisations starting from or carrying out their activities in any one's territories.

c. Both parties will refrain from, directly or indirectly, interfering in the domestic affairs of the other party for any political, economic or other reasons. Both parties should proceed in their mutual relationship from the principles contained in Article 2, paras. 3 and 4 of the U.N. Charter.

3. Both parties will agree upon fixing safe and mutually recognised frontiers between them to be drawn on a map or maps agreed upon by

both parties and becoming later a part of the final agreement within the framework of peace taking into consideration the agreement between the two parties.

(a) Establishing demilitarized zones.

(b) Practical and technical arrangements.

(c) The status of Jerusalem and the final arrangements connected with it.

The safe recognised frontiers shall be as close as possible to the armistice lines with the exception of what is included in Article Four. The changes to be carried out are those agreed upon by both parties for security, administrative or economic reasons.

4. Jordan and Israel will work out an agreement upon the status of Jerusalem and the final arrangements for the municipal border lines of the unified city.

Both parties are agreed that Jerusalem has got a special status proceeding from the following principles:

(a) It should be a unified city without any restrictions upon the passage of persons or goods inside it.

(b) There should be no restrictions upon the free arrival to the unified city from any nation.

(c) The administrative arrangements for the unified city should observe the interests of all its population and of the Jewish, Moslem and Christian communities, and the two government of Israel and Jordan should be guaranteed their parts in the civil, economic and religious life of the city.

5. Jordan shall take part in the efforts for working out a settlement for the Gaza Strip issue in accordance with point four of the general principles of the final agreement between Israel and the U.A.R.

6. Non-violation of the territories of any of the two parties.

In order to guarantee the recognised frontiers the two parties will follow the text of the last procedural article of this document in order to work out an agreement upon the demilitarized zones and the steps for guaranteeing their demilitarization as well as the other effective security measures.

7. Both parties are agreed and the Security Council reaffirms that:

(a) The Straits of Tiran are an international waterway.

(b) Freedom of navigation for all states in-

cluding Israel in the Tiran Straits and the Aqaba Gulf.

8. In order to carry out a just settlement for the Palestinian refugees problem both parties will accept the refugees from the war of 1948 including those under the I.N.R.A. supervision and give them free choice between returning to Israel or getting settled with reparations. Both parties are agreed upon the urgent need for carying out such an agreement by texts agreed upon between them in a manner defining the arrangements for return or settlement as well as the number of persons returning or getting settled annually for the purpose of implementing the U.N. decision concerning the refugees. This method is endorsed by Jordan, Israel and other parties including the U.A.R. and those which Ambassador Jarring considers their taking part as necessary and desirable. If both parties agree, and Ambassador Jarring consents, an international committee should be entrusted to ascertain the refugees wishes. Both parties agree that the implementation of the other articles of the final agreement should not be dependant upon the settle-

ment of the refugees problem since the first part of the refugees choosing to return will arrive in Israel during three months of concluding the final agreement between the two parties.

9. Both parties, Jordan and Israel, agree upon the mutual respect of the sovereignty. territorial integrity and inviolability and political independence of each other and their right to line in peace within safe recognised frontiers free of threats and acts of violence.

10. The agreement is registered in a document signed by both parties and deposited directly with U.N. following the deposit of the document, the U.N. Secretary General is requested by both parties directly to inform the Security Council and its members in U.N. of what has been agreed upon. In carrying out this final agreement it should be understood by both parties that their commitments to each other will be mutual and inter-connected. The final agreement shall stipulate that any violation of its articles by any party entitles the other party to consider it umbinding upon it totally or partially. As soon as the document is deposited it shall be binding on

both parties and irrevocable and its articles will be carried out by the states of the two parties.

11. Both parties agree to submit the final agreement including the maps fixing the final frontiers, to the Security Council for endorsement. It should be understood that the agreement between Jordan and Israel shall be parallel to an agreement between Egypt and Israel.

It shall be understood also that France, Britain, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. shall submit and support a decision in the Security Council in which they undertake to employ and concentrate their efforts in the future for helping the two parties to abide by the articles of this agreement of the final commitments.

"The tragedy of the people of Palestine is that their country was "given" by a foreign Power to another people for the creation of a new State".

BERTRAND RUSSELL
January 31, 1970

"In 1903, the British Government offered sixth Zionist Congress the territory of Uganda for the establishment of a Jewish National Home. This we accepted by 295 against 175 votes."

WEIZMAN,
Trial and Error,
P. 117

"All that we have taken we shall hold. During the ceasefire, we shall organize administration with fiercer energy, strengthen our footing in town and hamlet, speed up colonization and Aliyah, and look to the Army".

BEN - GURION
Rebirth and Destiny of Israel